

*Leason 3-2*

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

1 April 1959

25X1A9a

COMMENTS ON TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR THE IR REVIEW PANEL

*dis*  
*this is the*

1. Seems over-long, ~~for the IR Review Panel~~, repetitious. Leaves impression of fuzzy, not precise, frame of reference. Also, are overlapping statements--need to sort out main from subordinate points.

2. P. 2. Another set of groupings:

- a. What does IR do?
- b. What do consumers want it to do?
- c. How are consumers utilizing it?
- d. What is the present philosophy of IR?
- e. What trends bear on IR's future?
- f. Conclusions and recommendations.

3. The review panel seems loaded with people committed to the IR viewpoint. I get the impression that the terms of reference, and the selections for PFR in the margins, reflect undue influence on the part of these panel members. IR people are all right, it's simply that the panel seems less likely to be objective and dispassionate.

4. P. 3. <sup>25X1A9a</sup> ~~██████████~~ would like next to last sentence translated as: "What jobs are being done which are not based on requests but which are oriented to the IR mission in its broader sense?"

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

5. P. 7, bottom of page. When does "change" become a "trend"?

6. It would seem that Sec's VI - VIII go into sub-topics that lead the investigation off the main track. VII-VIII could be eliminated almost entirely. I really think that this is such a bucket of mud that the panel may never get back on dry land.

7. P. 4. Para's 1 and 2 are different in kind from para. 3. Should they be run together under the same heading like this?

8. Sec. III. This mixes limitations which result from arbitrary outside influences with internal developments which result from conscious planning.

9. Sec's IV and V. The first and last sentence of each are repetitive.